UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

———————————

**No. 13-7624**

———————————

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

            Plaintiff - Appellee,

    v.

DARRYLE EDWARD ROBERTSON, a/k/a Tiger,

            Defendant - Appellant.

———————————

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore.  J. Frederick Motz, Senior District Judge. (1:01-cr-00304-JFM-3)

———————————

Submitted:  February 27, 2014      Decided:  March 4, 2014

———————————

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

———————————

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

———————————

Darryle Edward Robertson, Appellant Pro Se.  John Francis Purcell, Jr., Assistant United States Attorney, Stephen Schenning, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

———————————

PER CURIAM:

Darryle Edward Robertson seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion and denying his request for a certificate of appealability. We dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction because the notice of appeal was not timely filed.

When the United States or its officer or agency is a party, the notice of appeal must be filed no more than sixty days after the entry of the district court's final judgment or order, Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(1)(B), unless the district court extends the appeal period under Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(5), or reopens the appeal period under Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(6). "[T]he timely filing of a notice of appeal in a civil case is a jurisdictional requirement." Bowles v. Russell, 551 U.S. 205, 214 (2007).

The district court's orders were entered on the docket on October 14, 2011, and October 2, 2012. The notice of appeal was filed, at the earliest, on October 1, 2013. Because Robertson failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials

before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED